```
VZCZCXYZ0004
OO RUEHWEB

DE RUEHGV #1240/01 3542038
ZNY SSSSS ZZH
O 202038Z DEC 09
FM USMISSION GENEVA
TO RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 1054
RUEAIIA/CIA WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE
RUEKDIA/DIA WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE
RUEKJCS/CJCS WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE
RUEKJCS/VCJCS WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE
RUEKJCS/JOINT STAFF WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE
RHEHNSC/NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE
RUEKJCS/SECDEF WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE
RUEHNO/USMISSION USNATO IMMEDIATE 6113
RHMFISS/DEPT OF ENERGY WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE
RHMFISS/DTRA ALEX WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE
RUESDT/DTRA-OSES DARMSTADT GE IMMEDIATE
RUENAAA/CNO WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE
RHMFISS/DIRSSP WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE
INFO RUEHTA/AMEMBASSY ASTANA PRIORITY 3292
RUEHKV/AMEMBASSY KYIV PRIORITY 2302
RUEHMO/AMEMBASSY MOSCOW PRIORITY 7509

S E C R E T GENEVA 001240

SIPDIS

DEPT FOR T, VCI AND EUR/PRA
DOE FOR NNSA/NA-24
CIA FOR WINPAC
JCS FOR J5/DDGSA
SECDEF FOR OSD(P)/STRATCAP
NAVY FOR CNO-N5JA AND DIRSSP
AIRFORCE FOR HQ USAF/ASX AND ASXP
DTRA FOR OP-OS OP-OSA AND DIRECTOR
NSC FOR LOOK
DIA FOR LEA

E.O. 12958: DECL: 12/19/2019
TAGS: KACT MARR PARM PREL RS US START
SUBJECT: START FOLLOW-ON NEGOTIATIONS, GENEVA
(SFO-GVA-VII):  (U) MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING WORKING
GROUP MEETING, DECEMBER 14, 2009

Classified By:  A/S Rose E. Gottemoeller, United States
START Negotiator.  Reasons:  1.4(b) and (d).

¶1.  (U) This is SFO-GVA-VII-150.

¶2.  (U) Meeting Date:  December 15, 2009
                 Time:  10:00 A.M. - 12:30 P.M.
                Place:  U.S. Mission, Geneva


-------
SUMMARY
-------

¶3.  (S) The Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) Working Group
Chairs, Mr. Trout and Gen Orlov, met at the U.S. Mission on
December 15, Orlov and Trout again discussed the nomenclature
for nuclear weapons for heavy bombers.  The Russian position
was finally clarified to be "Nuclear Warheads Counted for
Deployed Heavy Bombers."  Orlov announced that the Russian
Federation had agreed to the three U.S. categories of heavy
bombers, and had deleted the "non-deployed" categories
related to heavy bombers.  Trout agreed, based on a U.S.
non-paper dated December 7, 2009, to include "heavy bombers
equipped for non-nuclear armaments" as a category of data in
the database.  End Summary.

¶4.  (U) SUBJECT SUMMARY:  Let's Talk Heavy Bombers; and Some
Remaining Issues

------------------------
LET'S TALK HEAVY BOMBERS
------------------------
```

¶5. (S) Orlov started out the meeting by asking to continue the discussion from the previous day regarding the nomenclature for nuclear weapons for heavy bombers. This time, with the help of U.S. lawyer, Mr. Brown, and numerous references to the START Treaty, the Russian position was determined to be "nuclear warheads counted for deployed heavy bombers." Trout again told Orlov that he would take the new information back to his head of delegation.

¶6. (S) Orlov announced that the Russian side had agreed to the U.S. construct regarding heavy bombers. First, he said, we agree that there are three categories of heavy boQers: deployed heavy bombers; heavy bombers equipped for non-nuclear armaments; and test heavy bombers. Additionally, he stated, the Russian side was dropping all references to "non-deployed" in relation to heavy bombers as the Russian side agreed with the U.S. position that all heavy bombers equipped for nuclear armaments were deployed. Finally, he stated that the Russian side was deleting the category of "airbase for heavy bombers equipped for non-nuclear armaments" as the Russian side understood the United States would have both nuclear and non-nuclear types of bombers at some bases.

¶7. (S) Trout thanked Orlov for such good news but clarified that the U.S. position was to not list heavy bombers equipped for non-nuclear armaments in the database. Orlov and Mr. Pischulov looked at each other in surprise, stating that the U.S. paper (dated December 7, 2009) regarding heavy bombers, delivered last week, included this category of heavy bomber.

Orlov commented that the Russian side had been up until nearly 3:00 a.m. discussing this issue and had based their decision on this paper.

¶8. (S) Trout decided to take a break and see if he could obtain further clarification on this issue. He returned later and explained that he had discussed this issue with his head of delegation, and the United States would agree to list heavy bombers equipped for non-nuclear armaments in the database. However, Trout asked some clarifying questions regarding the inclusion of this category, specifically asking whether the notifications associated with heavy bomber movement and changes of data in the database would apply to this category. Orlov deferred, stating that this notification issue was for the Notification Working Group. Trout asked that, as the U.S. understood the Agreed Statement on B-1Bs, after the last bomber had been converted all numerical data regarding the converted B-1Bs would be deleted from the database. Orlov replied that no, this was not the case, but agreed to discuss the matter further with his delegation, stating that perhaps after the last B-1B was converted this matter could be brought before the Bilateral Consultation Commission (BCC) to decide what to do.

SOME REMAINING ISSUES

¶9. (S) Turning to space launch facilities, Orlov asked whether Trout had accepted the Russian-proposed language for space launch facilities using "non-deployed ICBMs and SLBMs" and "non-deployed launchers for ICBMs and SLBMs." Trout agreed to use the first term, but said he would get back with Orlov on the use of the Russian-proposed text regarding launchers.

¶10. (S) Trout agreed to drop references to throw-weight and launch weight in Section VII, ICBM and SLBM Technical Data.

¶11. (S) Orlov agreed to drop some technical data in Section VIII in the heavy bomber technical section, but not all. Specifically, he stated that the Russian side had decided to delete their proposed technical characteristics for heavy bombers equipped for non-nuclear armaments, but not for heavy bombers equipped for nuclear armaments.

¶12. (S) Trout and Orlov agreed to make some changes to Section X, Other Data, to track some of the decisions and changes made in the past 2 days.

CLOSING COMMENTS

¶13. (S) Trout asked to have another meeting the next morning to allow for discussion of any issues that could arise from the evening's first technical conforming meeting for the database. Orlov agreed that this was a good idea, and commented that the group had made great progress.

¶14. (U) Documents provided: None.

¶15. (U) Participants:

UNITED STATES

Mr. Trout
Mr. Brown
LT. Lobner
Mr. French (Int)

RUSSIA:

Gen Orlov
Col Pischulov
Ms. Evarovskaya (Int)

¶16. (U) Gottemoeller sends.
GRIFFITHS